



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,136 .	08/20/2003	Hiroaki Takano	KON-1811	. 6489
20311 LUCAS & ME	7590 05/01/2007 RCANTI LLP	EXAMINER ·		
. 475 PARK AV	ENUE SOUTH		BRINICH, STEPHEN M	
15TH FLOOR NEW YORK, 1	NY 10016		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,.			2625	
		•		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			. 05/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

DATE MAILED:

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ı	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10644136	8/20/03	TAKANO ET AL	KON-1811	
		EXAMINER Stephen M. Brinich		
LUCAS & MERCANTI 475 PARK AVENUE S				
15TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10016			ART UNIT	PAPER
	1		2625	20070426

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner for Patents** 

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/644,136	TAKANO ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Stephen M. Brinich	2625					
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	ne correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS in e, cause the application to become ABANDO	ION.  e timely filed  from the mailing date of this communication.  DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status	•						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This 3) Since this application is in condition for allower	s action is non-final.	prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	or ·						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposition and accomposition accomposition and accomposition accomposition and accomposition acc	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	• •					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	Date					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

#### DETAILED ACTION

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, lines 18-19; claim 15, lines 22-23; claim 29, lines 23-24; and claim 43, lines 23-24, the phrase "the image data obtained by applying the optimized image processing conditions" lacks proper antecedent basis (the preceding recitations describe optimizing conditions of the recited predetermined image processing, but does not actually recite a step or means for performing of the recited predetermined image processing and thus does not provide proper antecedent basis for the image data resulting from that processing).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 43-46, insofar as they are understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 43-46 drawn to functional descriptive material NOT claimed as residing on a computer readable medium. MPEP 2106.IV.B.1(a) (Functional Descriptive Material) states:

Data structures not claimed as embodied in a computerreadable medium are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer.

Such claimed data structures do not define any structural or functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized.

Claims 43-46, while defining a memory medium, does not define a "computer-readable medium" and is thus non-statutory for that reason. A "memory medium" can range from paper on which the program is written, to a program simply contemplated and memorized by a person. The examiner suggests amending the claim to embody the program on "computer-readable medium" in order to make the claim statutory.

In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with the data structure defines structural and functional

Application/Control Number: 10/644,136 Page 4

Art Unit: 2625

interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory." - MPEP 2106.IV.B.1(a)

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 1-46, insofar as they are understood, would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
- 6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Re claims 1, 15, 29, & 43 (and dependent claims 2-14, 16-28, 30-42, & 44-46), the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited arrangement of identifying a type of image capture device, generating scene-referred image data by normalizing processing for each type of image capturing device, optimizing image processing conditions using the scene-referred data, and subjecting the results to gradation processing to produce a particular reflection density and gamma value.

## Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number: 10/644,136

Art Unit: 2625

Naito et al, Terashita, and Sakamoto disclose examples of image gradation, normalization, and gamma processing.

8. Any inquiry concerning the contents of this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430.

Any inquiry relating to the status of this application or proceeding or any inquiry of a general nature concerning application processing should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 571-272-1000.

The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:00-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

The examiner's unit designation has been changed from "Art Unit 2624" to "Technology Division 2625" (as of March 20, 2006).

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 571-273-8300 (as of July 15, 2005).

Application/Control Number: 10/644,136

Art Unit: 2625

Hand-carried correspondence may be delivered to the Customer Service Window, located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Stephen M Brinich

Examiner

Technology Division 2625

Page 6

smb April 27, 2007